

**QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY ON THE FINAL RFP FOR THE WEST VALLEY PHASE 1  
DECOMMISSIONING – FACILITY DISPOSITION PROCUREMENT AND THE GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSES**

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
<b>138.</b>	C.6.1 Vs. Attachment L.11 C-24 L-xx	<p>Section C.6.1 states that “Liquids are expected in all 15 tanks, but primarily in the UPC and LWC Vessels, and may total in excess of 15,000 gallons.”</p> <p>By contrast, Attachment L.11 states that “LWC has 10 tanks, all flushed, drained and in place.” “UPC has 2 tanks, drained and in place”</p> <p>Attachment L.11 also identifies 4 tanks in the MPPB that contain 26,000 gallons, rather than being empty, versus 15,000 gallons, as described in Section C.6.1.</p> <p>Please clarify which tanks still have material in them and how much.</p>	Amendment 001 clarified that the four Main Plant Processing Building (MPPB) vessels are expected to contain 26,000 gallons as stated in Attachment L-11- Waste Management and Nuclear Materials table.
<b>139.</b>	C.6.1, page C-23	<p>Please provide current photographs of Evacuated canisters.</p> <p>Has DOE specified any special handling or packaging requirements for these canisters?</p>	<p>Pictures of the evacuated canisters will be made available through this WVDP procurement website in the Documents Library.</p> <p>DOE has not specified any special handling or packaging requirements, The solicitation’s Performance Work Statement (PWS) specifies this waste should be stored in the same system with High Level Waste (HLW) Canisters in safe storage.</p>
<b>140.</b>	C.6.1, page C-23	<p>Please provide detailed drawings of the existing ventilation equipment in the equipment decon room, including airflow in cubic feet per minute (cfm) and the location of the ventilation system components.</p> <p>Please verify that the existing ventilation equipment is currently operable and HEPA filtered.</p>	<p>Drawings of the Main Plant Process Building (MPPB) drawings are available as Export Controlled Information (ECI). To request ECI, prospective Offerors shall follow the instructions on the Requesting Sensitive Information section of this web site.</p> <p>The existing MPPB ventilation system is operable and HEPA filtered however filter banks were last changed out in the Ventilation Exhaust Cell in March 1994 and November 2002 in the Head End Ventilation. In addition the MPPB ventilation system contains radioactive material as described in the Radiological Inventory Reports.</p>
<b>141.</b>	Resubmittal of previous comments/ questions	In response to Clause B.8 (b), we request that DOE provide a complete list of all other existing contractors with whom	A list of the current incumbent subcontractors has been posted in the Documents Library of the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site under “West Valley Environmental Services Contract General Information.” This list is for information

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		we might need to place agreements.	only. It is up to the Offeror to determine what subcontracts are necessary to complete the work proposed.
<b>142.</b>	Resubmittal of previous comments/ questions  Section C	In Clause C.6.1/Facility Starting Conditions, the section gives an overview of the starting conditions but does not include details. For instance, there are numerous statements such as “Significant contamination remains on the walls of certain cells...” but no details on which cells or the levels of contamination or radioisotopes involved. To truly estimate waste volumes, waste types, and the costs of decommissioning and demolition, a great deal of additional information will be necessary. In particular, we will need to know (1) what levels of contamination and radioisotopes are present in each room, (2) what types of fixatives have been used and to what depth in each room, (3) the thickness of each wall, and (4) any equipment left in each room and the levels of contamination of that equipment. Please provide the most detailed information available concerning the starting conditions we are to expect and the characterization of each room in the facility on the procurement web site. The other option is to give each offeror a standard set of assumptions concerning levels of contamination and waste volumes that will be generated (not just legacy waste) for use in its proposal. Current information similar to Tables 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8 in the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning Plan would normalize the assumptions on contaminants and radiation levels.	Amendment 001 provided updated information regarding the contract starting conditions in the Main Plant Process Building (MPPB) including depth of contamination, contamination mechanisms and radiological postings.
<b>143.</b>	Page C-13, Section C.1.3.3	Contractor is required to input and maintain all data required in the Facility Information Management System (FIMS). Can bidders be provided access to content of the WV FIMS in order to better understand the current quality of the data and to assist in developing cost estimates for the bid?	Currently, the Facility Information Management System (FIMS) does not contain any WVDP facilities as none are federally owned, however the Contractor will still be responsible for inputting and maintaining any data that may be required during performance of the contract.

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
144.	Section C: Performance Work Statement; Section C.6.0 Facility Disposition; Subsection C.6.1 MPPB Demolition & Removal-CLIN 003 Page C-25	<p><b>Facility Starting Conditions:</b> Paragraph 6, on page C-25, states: “Significant contamination remains on the walls of certain cells, and this contamination may exist at depth in the structure.”</p> <p>Please clarify which cells are referenced in the above statement, and provide average surface dose rates, depth of contamination and contaminants of concern.</p>	Amendment 001 provided updated information regarding the contract starting conditions in the Main Plant Process Building (MPPB) including depth of contamination, contamination mechanisms and radiological postings.
145.	Section C: Performance Work Statement; Section C.6.0 Facility Disposition; Subsection C.6.1 MPPB Demolition & Removal-CLIN 003 and Section L, Attachment L-11 Page C-25	<p><b>Facility Starting Conditions:</b> Paragraph 6; on page C-25, states:” About half a dozen cells will have had their original floors grouted to the depth of about one foot. The grout was applied as shielding over concrete floors that were damaged by leaks from acidic isotopic solutions onto the floors. Another approximately half dozen lined cells may have been grouted to comparable depth to reduce surface dose. Contamination at depth in the structure may result in the creation of TRU or MLLW streams during demolition.”</p> <p>Attachment L-11 identifies approximately 18 cells within the MPPB Decommissioning scope, which have grouted floors between 6 and 30 inches thick. Please provide the surface dose rate reached by the application of the grout for shielding. Please provide an estimate of the MLLW and TRU waste that will be generated by removal of the grout, including the extent of substructure contamination in these cells.</p>	<p>Amendment 001 provided updated information regarding the contract starting conditions in the Main Plant Processing Building (MPPB) including depth of contamination, contamination mechanisms and radiological postings.</p> <p>It is up to the Offeror to determine the amount of waste that will be generated from its proposed approach to completing the work.</p>
146.	C.1.3.2 C-12	<p>C.1.3.2 states that “Contractor shall provide the resources necessary to perform the contract work scope including.”</p> <p>Please identify all systems (business management, planning, scheduling, human resources, etc.) that are in place and in use by the current contractor? Will these systems remain in place for use by the offeror?</p>	The contractor should not assume it will be able to use systems the incumbent contractor currently has in place.
147.	Section C: Performance Work Statement; Section C.6.0 Facility Disposition; Subsection C.6.1 MPPB Demolition & Removal-CLIN 003 Page C-25	<p><b>Facility Starting Conditions:</b> Paragraph 5, on page C-25, states: “Almost all surfaces will have dose rates less than 200 mrem/hr on contact. However the stainless steel cell liners in the General Purpose Cell, Process Mechanical Cell, and Extraction Cell #1 may generate much greater external dose once they are exposed.”</p>	Amendment 001 provided updated information regarding the contract starting conditions in the Main Plant Processing Building (MPPB) including depth of contamination, contamination mechanisms and radiological postings.

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		<p>(4) Please clarify whether the 200 mrem/hr contact dose rate referred to above applies to the hot cells, the operating area walls, and the floor areas, or is this value limited to a particular area (i.e. warm aisles and contact operating areas)</p> <p>(5) Question: Does Table 4-7 (page 4-18) of the Phase 1 Decommissioning Plan entitled “Measured Maximum Gamma Radiation Levels in the Process Building Area” reflect the facility starting conditions for the General Purpose Cell, Head-end Ventilation Cell and Process Mechanical Cell? Can DOE provide equivalent values for the Extraction Cells #1, #2 and #3? If this table is not accurate, please provide the correct starting conditions.</p> <p>(6) Question: Does Table 4-6 (page 4-17) of the Phase 1 Decommissioning Plan entitled “Estimated Total Activity in Representative Process Building Areas” accurately depict the starting conditions in the various cells identified? If not, please provide the correct starting conditions.</p>	
148.	Section C: Performance Work Statement; Section C.6.0 Facility Disposition; Subsection C.6.1 MPPB Demolition & Removal-CLIN 003 Page C-25	<p><b>Facility Starting Conditions:</b> Paragraph 6, on page C-25, states: “Significant contamination remains on the walls of certain cells, and this contamination may exist at depth in the structure.”</p> <p>Please clarify which cells are referenced in the above statement, and provide average surface dose rates, depth of contamination and contaminants of concern?</p>	Amendment 001 provided updated information regarding the contract starting conditions in the Main Plant Processing Building (MPPB) including depth of contamination, contamination mechanisms and radiological postings.
149.	Section C: Performance Work Statement; Section C.6.0 Facility Disposition; Subsection C.6.1 MPPB Demolition & Removal-CLIN 003 and Section L, Attachment L-11 Page C-25	<p><b>Facility Starting Conditions:</b> Paragraph 6; on page C-25, states:” About half a dozen cells will have had their original floors grouted to the depth of about one foot. The grout was applied as shielding over concrete floors that were damaged by leaks from acidic isotopic solutions onto the floors. Another approximately half dozen lined cells may have been grouted to comparable depth to reduce surface dose. Contamination at depth in the structure may result in the creation of TRU or MLLW streams during demolition.”</p> <p>Attachment L-11 identifies approximately 18 cells within the MPPB Decommissioning scope, which have grouted floors between 6 and 30 inches thick. Please provide the</p>	<p>Amendment 001 provided updated information regarding the contract starting conditions in the Main Plant Processing Building (MPPB) including depth of contamination, contamination mechanisms and radiological postings.</p> <p>It is up to the Offeror to determine the amount of waste that will be generated from its proposed approach to completing the work.</p>

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		surface dose rate reached by the application of the grout for shielding. Please provide an estimate of the MLLW and TRU waste that will be generated by removal of the grout, including the extent of substructure contamination in these cells?	
150.	Page C-31/32, Section C.8.0 NRC-Licensed Disposal Area (NDA) - CLIN 001	Scope requires removal of the Liquid Pre-treatment System, regarding of the footprint, and installation of an XR-5 cover over the area. Please provide the design for the NDA cover, including grades in the vicinity of the Liquid Pretreatment System.	The requested documents will be made available through this WVDP procurement website in the Documents Library.
151.	General	Please provide a list of current subcontracts, including scope and expiration dates.	A list of the current WVES incumbent subcontractors has been posted in the Documents Library of the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site under “West Valley Environmental Services Contract General Information.”
152.	Sections C.6.4, C.9.0	Section C.9.0 states that “All TRU waste shall be packaged in accordance with the Waste Acceptance Criteria and the contact handled TRU and remote handled TRU packaging instructions for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant until a defense determination can be made.” We understand that DOE is currently working on the defense determination, but no information is provided in the RFP regarding the anticipated schedule for completing those activities. Section C.6.4 state that “The Contractor shall maintain the RHWF in a safe, stable condition until all remote handled waste has been shipped for disposal. Once all remote handled waste has been shipped, the Contractor shall decontaminate, characterize and RCRA clean close the facility.” Because the waste can’t be shipped until the defense determination is made, please provide the date when you expect that effort to be complete so that all Offerors use the same basis for their proposals. Alternatively, please change the language in C.6.4 to allow contractors to decontaminate, characterize, and RCRA clean close the facility upon completion of packaging rather than following shipment.	Section L, Attachment L-11 instructs the Offerors to assume TRU waste will be stored on site for the duration of the contract period.
153.		Would the direct transfer and loading of the HLW canisters from dry storage cask systems into the certified transportation system be construed to be “repackaging” as specified in the RFP? Note: this type of transfer of a	The movement of the overpack to the transportation system would not be considered repackaging.

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		canister to the 10 CFR 71 transport overpack is a typical operational step for multi-purpose canister systems commonly in use at commercial nuclear power stations in the US and is not considered “repackaging” because the spent fuel (i.e. waste) is not removed from the canister.	
154.		Will 10 CFR 72 regulations (i.e. 72.104 and 72.106) for off-site normal and accident dose be applicable to the project?	10 CFR 72 regulations are not applicable to the work described in the solicitation’s Performance Work Statement. 10 CFR 830, Subpart B regulations are applicable to the work described in the solicitation’s Performance Work Statement.
155.		What are the planned dose limits for operations staff at the WVDP that will be applicable to the preparation of the canisters and overpacks to be deployed at the WVDP?	There has been no dose limits established, other than those required by Sections J-1 and J-2 regulations and DOE Orders, for any specific task in the solicitation’s Performance Work Statement (PWS).
156.		Will facilities be required to be provided for the future transfer and loading of the HLW canisters into the certified storage system? Per the RFP, the MPPB will be demolished after relocation of the HLW canisters. Will new facilities be required to be provided in the future?	As specified in Section C.5.0 of the solicitation’s Performance Work Statement, the offeror is responsible for designing, constructing and operating a High Level Waste (HLW) Canister Interim Storage System and moving the High Level Waste (HLW) canisters from the Main Plant Process Building to the Interim Storage System. It is up to the offeror to propose a method for completing these activities
157.		Please provide estimated radioactive source terms and decay heat loads for the HLW canister inventory.	The requested documents will be made available through this WVDP procurement website in the Documents Library.
158.		Please provide the off-gassing rate for the vitrified HLW at expected storage and transport temperatures, and expected major gaseous radionuclides.	The requested documents will be made available through this WVDP procurement website in the Documents Library.
159.		What is contained in the two evacuated canisters?	Vitrified residual waste resulting from the flushing of the vitrification components.
160.		Does DOE anticipate that cells below 100’ will be grouted or otherwise filled?	No.
161.		It is our understanding that DOE’s characterization contractor will have primary responsibility for environmental monitoring and characterization. In that regard, please delineate the points of interface, particularly in regard to the Phase 1 contractor’s responsibilities for environmental and ground water monitoring as described in Section C.1.1.1.1 (Environment) paragraph 3 and section C.1.1.1.1.E of the Performance Work Statement.	The ECS contractor will complete activities described in the Characterization Sampling and Analysis Plan (CSAP) and Phase 1 Final Status Survey Plan (FSSP). The Phase 1 Decommissioning-Facilities Disposition contractor will be responsible for the WVDP environmental monitoring program. The Phase 1 Decommissioning-Facilities Disposition contractor is expected to coordinate and provide physical access to waste storage facilities so that other DOE contractors may store and/or treat their waste. DOE expects that the generator of the waste, i.e. other DOE contractors, will characterize their waste in accordance with DOE O 435.1. DOE expects that the Phase 1 Decommissioning-Facilities Disposition contractor would dispose of relatively small volumes (<500ft <sup>3</sup> /y) of low-level waste such as

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
			investigation-derived wastes. The Phase 1 Decommissioning-Facilities Disposition contractor will be responsible for ensuring that packaging, transportation and disposal requirements for this waste are met.
162.		Please provide current subcontracts that may be transferred to the new contractor.	A list of the current WVES incumbent subcontractors has been posted in the Documents Library of the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site under “West Valley Environmental Services Contract General Information.” It is up to the offeror to determine if any of these subcontracts will need to be transferred to the offeror.
163.	Section C, Attachment C-1,  Section L, Attachment L-11,	Definition of Terms (page C-36): defines legacy waste as, “ <u>Legacy Waste</u> : Any and all wastes in storage prior to July 1, 2011, along with such waste processed during the Interim Endstate Contract into new or existing containers and waste generated from that processing.”  Cost Assumption Information, Waste Management and Nuclear Materials, Waste Stream/Total Estimated Volume of Waste on June 30, 2011 Table (next to last page and last page): provides the estimated waste volumes in storage on-site at WVDP.  Should we assume that the wastes listed in the Attachment L-11 table are Legacy Waste?	No, the Attachment L-11 table includes HLW in the HLW Tank Farm and liquids contained in numerous vessels in the MPPB that do not meet the definition of Legacy Waste.
164.	Section C.9.0,	Waste Management and Nuclear Materials, Scope, 1st and 4th paragraphs (pages C-32 and C-33) and Section L, Attachment L-11, Cost Assumption Information, Waste Management and Nuclear Materials, 4th paragraph and note 2 (next to last page and last page): What are DOE’s criteria for TRU waste storage? It is our understanding that DOE is currently evaluating the Drum Cell for TRU Waste Storage. The RFP states that the Drum Cell is to be removed and only the greater than 100-foot elevation of the MPPB, the FRS Fuel Pool, and the RHWF will remain. Does DOE want TRU waste stored on the North Plateau given the next phase of work will require removal of these facilities?	The DOE expects the Contractor to determine the optimal location for safe and efficient onsite storage by taking into consideration Phase 1 Decommissioning Plan strategies.
165.		Can we get current condition pictures of all the cells?	Current pictures of all the cells are not available or practical given accessibility and ALARA concerns. However numerous recent photos of the MPPB are available in the “Walking Tour and Facility

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
			Description” report. This information/documentation is available as Export Controlled Information (ECI). To request ECI, prospective Offerors shall follow the instructions on the Requesting Sensitive Information section of this web site.
166.		Are there any specific expectations for the MPPB end state condition at grade?	Yes the performance requirements are discussed in the “Objective” segment of Section C.6.1.
167.	C.6.1, page C23, paragraph one, sentence two:	“The first floor slab should remain intact...” What is an acceptable closure for the openings and what are the acceptable radiological conditions of these exposed surfaces?	Any proposed closure method for openings must meet the performance requirements discussed in the “Objective” segment of Section C.6.1 such as preventing the spread of contamination from all exposed surfaces.
168.		Will there be any opportunity to see the earthen dams at Lake 1, Lake 2, and the spillway?	These facilities were not included in the site tour due to accessibility issues however information is provided in the “Pre-Proposal Site Tours Presentation” at the “News and Announcements” section of this website.
169.		On page C-25, which cells will already have had the piping removed, how much will remain in those cells, and which cells will not have had any piping removed?	Amendment 001 provided updated information regarding the contract starting conditions in the Main Plant Process Building (MPPB) including depth of contamination, contamination mechanisms and radiological postings.
170.		Do the waste volume estimates in Section L, Attachment L-11 include collection and packaging of obsolete materials and waste currently located throughout the MPPB?	Yes they are accounted for in the “Reuse” line of the table.
171.	C.2.1 C -2	The scope associated with the dams is RFP Section C.2.1, page C-2 states, “repair <u>may</u> entail dredging of the channel connecting the two reservoirs; repair of access road drainage features and dam groin areas; restoration of the emergency spillway; repair of the outfall and intake for the 18ft culvert including headwall reinforcement; and design and installation of erosion control improvements to prevent erosion of the spillway toe, effusion of the outfall area, and erosion or scouring damage of any other susceptible areas”. Please provide a specific basis for estimating to ensure that all offerors bid to the same scope.	For proposal preparation purposes, the Section C.2.1 scope the offerors should assume is “repair <u>will</u> entail dredging of the channel connecting the two reservoirs; repair of access road drainage features and dam groin areas; restoration of the emergency spillway; repair of the outfall and intake for the 18ft culvert including headwall reinforcement; and design and installation of erosion control improvements to prevent erosion of the spillway toe, effusion of the outfall area, and erosion or scouring damage of any other susceptible areas”.
172.	C.9 C-33	What is status and schedule for completion of the defense waste determination?	The WVDP defense determination is not complete and currently not being pursued. However the WVDP TRU wastes are being considered in the Greater Than Class C (GTCC) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
173.	C.9.0 (and Attachment L-11) C-33	The SOW and Attachment L-11 (last page, unnumbered) indicates that the Contractor is not responsible for disposal of liquids in HLW tanks 8D-1, -2, or -3. However, it is	DOE expects the Contractor to characterize the contents of 8D-4 and to provide a recommendation for their disposition. DOE will subsequently request a proposal from the Contractor if DOE pursues a



No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		silent on HLW Tank 8D-4 which, according to Attachment L-11, contains 10,000 gallons of liquid/sludge within that tank. Please clarify what DOE expects of the Contractor regarding 8D-4 and liquids removal. It would appear logical that this tank would be handled like the other three – no responsibility for liquids disposal.	recommendation for disposition.
174.	Attachment J-3 J-28	Attachment J-3, Item 146 requires documentation of a Criticality Safety Program Description, which – given the source terms of radioactivity on the West Valley site – does not seem applicable for West Valley – once the spent nuclear fuel was removed from the pools and shipped to INL a few years ago. Would DOE consider eliminating this required documentation?	No.
175.	Attachment L-11	Attachment L-11 provided in Amendment 001 has a table entitled "MPPB Beginning Condition Summary Synopsis" and a table entitled "Main Plant Process Building - Summary of Beginning Condition". The information in one table conflicts with information in the other table. Which table is correct?	The table entitled "Main Plant Process Building - Summary of Beginning Condition" on pages 13 through 19 of Attachment L-11 in Amendment 001 was included by mistake. Offerors should disregard this table. The table entitled "MPPB Beginning Condition Summary Synopsis" on pages 2 through 12 of Attachment L-11 in Amendment 001 is the correct table. An amendment will be issued correcting this error.